

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
May 13, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on May 13, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Cultural Resource Action Worksheet

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Item – April 15, 2003 CRWG Meeting

A summary of the April 2003 CRWG meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of the action item from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C47: Status:	Consolidate settlement issues on the Cultural Resource Action Worksheet Chris Acken with DWR consolidated the items on the worksheet and distributed the revised worksheet to CRWG participants for discussion during the meeting. The worksheet is included as Attachment 3 to this summary.
-------------------------------------	--

Study Plan Implementation Update

Janis Offermann, Cultural Resources Area Manager (RAM) with DWR reviewed the current status of the inventory effort. She informed the group that the ethnographers continue to conduct interviews, and the archaeological team is doing supplemental surveys. She added that the teams have been working on the Inventory Report for public distribution as well as developing a research strategy. Eric Ritter representing BLM asked if it was too early to do evaluations since the total database in relation to the final APE remains unclear. Janis answered that the report could always be amended and that additional survey work could be done if needed.

Eric Ritter asked about the sampling results in the report concerning apparent patterns of impacts and when a decision would be made to continue field survey work on areas indirectly impacted by the project but not included in the original area surveyed. Janis responded that characteristics of representative areas, or sampling, will be described and decisions made based on the results of that analysis. She added that approval would ultimately be sought from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), who will review the report, and she noted that this approach is consistent with current standard of practice. Janis also noted that any proposed developments in areas not previously surveyed would be inventoried in conjunction with those project proposals. Juanita Anglin representing the Cherokee requested a copy of the work plan: Janis will send a copy. Janis noted that the consulting team was developing a report for public distribution that would describe results in general terms and would not include identification or maps with site-specific information.

Maidu Advisory Council Update

Patty Reece Allen representing Berry Creek Rancheria provided the Maidu Advisory Council update. She reported on a recent trip to the West Sacramento facility that currently houses the remains and artifacts removed from the Oroville area prior to initial reservoir inundation. She added that they received inventory sheets to share with their tribal members in an effort to identify some of the items. The group is coordinating with Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) in planning another trip to the facility in July, and the tribes are developing a list of what they want available for viewing.

Resource Action Discussion

The Facilitator briefly reviewed the work from the last CRWG meeting, when the participants had revisited the issue tracker and ultimately asked DWR to consolidate the resource actions. Janis distributed the revised Cultural Resource Action Worksheet (see Attachment 3) and reviewed the categories by which DWR proposed to group the resource actions: Protection/Mitigation, Education, Interpretive Cultural Center/Curation Facility, Existing Visitor Center, Repatriation, Miscellaneous, Studies in Progress, Actions On-Going/Completed, Not Relicensing, and Clarification Needed. Janis suggested the participants review the Worksheet item by item to see whether they agree with both the categories and the placement of each item. She noted that some of the items have multiple components that have been cross-referenced in the Notes section of the Worksheet.

The participants reviewed the Worksheet and discussed potential resource actions. Eric Ritter asked how looters with private collections would be handled. The CRWG discussed options to address artifacts returned to the Native Americans by private parties, and Patty Reece Allen suggested that the tribes should handle those situations. The Facilitator noted that a protocol to handle such situations could be included in the Management Plan.

Ellen Clark representing DPR noted that the Maidu Village Display (item CRE#44) will always be evolving and, consequently, will never be considered 'finished'. She reported that some funding earmarked for display development has been identified by DPR for this year. Janis suggested that the Site Stewardship Program (CRE#62) be moved to the Protection/Mitigation category since this program is oriented toward improving site protection. The group agreed that the Stewardship Program is aimed at protection, while the funding concept noted in CRE#62 could be a settlement issue.

Janis explained that the items under the 'Studies in Progress' category are awaiting study results that will help categorize these issues. The Facilitator pointed out that CRE#33 is an example of a multi-issue statement that needs to be modified because Robinson's Corner is not in the project area but portions of the Beckwourth Trail are. The participants discussed how to deal with multi-issue statements when the desire is to carry the relevant issue forward while showing resolution for the other part of the statement. One option is to use strikeout to indicate the part that has been deleted while still carrying it forward as written. Another option is to break up the multi-issue statement into 'a' and 'b' components. DWR pointed out that the computer program used to create the Worksheet did not allow for redline/strikeout, so the CRWG decided to use 'a' and 'b' designations to separate multi-issue statements.

Eric Ritter suggested that Robinson's Corner may be related to the African American group experience. Janis Offermann responded that research into Robinson's Corner does not indicate that the location held significance for any one particular ethnic group. Chris Acken noted that if Robinson's Corner were included it would extend the project area ten miles to the south, and the Facilitator asked the participants to consider what effect the Oroville Facilities have had on Robinson's Corner as a test for inclusion. Janis added that Robinson's Corner could be included in the historical background portion of the report, if it was determined to be appropriate.

Eric Ritter asked how determinations could be made regarding potential National Register eligible sites if 100% of the total area is not surveyed. Janis responded that all areas where potential impacts can occur are being studied, and Steve Heipel with the consulting team added that the licensee must survey enough of the project area to determine what the effects are and what project activity they are resulting from. It was noted that there is no regulatory requirement for a 100% survey of the project area.

One participant asked if surveys could be conducted by air to identify looting and vandalism perhaps while reviewing aspects of dam safety. Eric Ritter stated that spotting artifacts or activity on the ground using air reconnaissance is very difficult, and Chris Acken added that an inspection of the dam for integrity would be conducted on the ground and not from the air. Eric Ritter stated that he is not suggesting a 100% survey approach but is interested in considering second stage surveys to verify findings. Janis responded that additional survey work has not been ruled out.

Janis explained that items categorized under Actions-Ongoing/Completed are not expected to be re-categorized and represent activities that are either underway or have been completed. She added that the interim projects have been clarified to be relicensing issues and the CRWG agreed that these items should be moved to the 'Completed' group as they are completed.

One participant asked about the status of unfinished reports (CRE#13). The CRWG discussed the early work done in the project area. Eric Ritter explained his role in the efforts and indicated that many of the studies might have been completed to the extent desired at the time. He indicated that the standard of practice has changed since the 1960s, and he added that graduate students did some of the work as masters or doctoral theses and other studies were also conducted and funded by universities. Eric Ritter provided a list of archaeological sites in and around Lake Oroville that may not have been analyzed or documented according to current standards.

The CRWG agreed to go through the list again to prioritize the potential resource actions. Steve Heipel added that the idea is to give a rating of high, medium, or low to each of the actions reflecting the importance of the action to the CRWG. The participants discussed each action, identifying the protection and mitigation measures as high in importance. One participant asked what is meant by the proposal to provide new traditional gathering sites (CRE#42). Patty Reece-Allen explained that it is meant to identify new areas that can be managed for traditional gathering activities. Ellen Clark with DPR mentioned a DPR outreach program for children designed to educate them about cultural resources by using reproductions of artifacts as an example of CRE#16. Steve Heipel commented that the next step would be to decide who would lead the efforts in development of resource action proposals for further discussion.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The CRWG suggested that DWR further consolidate the issues to eliminate redundancies, using 'a' and 'b' designations where applicable (as noted above), for discussion at the next CRWG meeting. Janis added that DWR would particularly focus on the Protection and Mitigation issues.

The next CRWG meeting will be:

Date: June 17, 2003
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.
Location: To be determined

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #C48: Send Work Plan document to Juanita Anglin.

Responsible: DWR Staff

Due Date: May 2003

Action Item #C49: Consolidate resource actions to eliminate redundancies and group according to goals.

Responsible: DWR Staff

Due Date: June 2003